

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 stand rejected.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks hereinbelow.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1, 3-10 and 20-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jain et al. (6,567,980), Takemoto (6,335,742) and Tomat et al. (6,784,925). Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 23 are believed to be allowable over the cited combination in that not one of Jain et al., Takemoto et al. nor Tomat et al. disclose the limitations of claim 1.

Jain et al. describes, generally, a video editor adapted to receive an analog video signal and to facilitate the process of organizing the video and audio content thereon into manageable video clips with associated metadata. In particular, Jain et al. describes a process for associating a clip track 332 with each video clip. Each clip track has metadata associated therewith. The metadata is application specific. (Col. 6, lines 61-65) The metadata can include for example, a Story Title, Report, Location, Shot Data, Air Date, Keywords, Summary and so on. (Col. 7, lines 1-10).

Jain et al. however does not provide a GUI having a main display area including a picture content iconic region, a graphical browser region and a hierarchical picture grouping iconic region.

Instead, Jain et al. shows only two examples of a graphical user interface Figs. 2 and 17. These examples are generally consistent in that they both lack a graphical browser region and a hierarchical picture grouping iconic region. For example, Figs. 2 and 17 both show that full display area of a display is occupied by video frame presentation areas 172 and 896 respectively, clip frame areas 184 and 912 respectively, a key frame area 176 and 904 respectively showing a set of thumbnail images each representing only one video stream and a CC-text area 178 and 908 respectively that display close captioned text associated with a video clip. The availability of all of these features in a single display is quite advantageous to a user of such a system and altering this presentation is

not even suggested by Jain et al. Jain et al. effectively teaches against combining the GUI shown in Figs. 2 or 17 with any other form of GUI to provide additional features unrelated to video processes, as doing so would reduce the efficiency of use provided by this GUI.

Thus, Jain et al. fails to provide any teaching or suggestion of the use of a graphical browser area or hierarchical picture grouping iconic region as claimed and effectively teaches against a combination intended to provide such features.

Further, Jain et al. can be said to enable rapid characterization and organization of a video stream at least in part because it does not require a user to change display levels to perform various tasks. Nothing in Jain et al. describes, shows or suggests a system that requires the use of multiple display levels for any purpose. Thus, to combine Jain et al. with any reference that does so eliminates one of the advantageous features of Jain et al.

Jain et al. also fails to provide a graphical browser region in the main display comprising selectable indicia of at least two graphical browsers utilized by said GUI, each indicia associated with a display level that allows a user to browse pictures in the database using a method that is different from other display levels.

Further, Jain et al. fails to provide selectable indicia within a graphical browser region that are each associated with a display level that allows a user to browse pictures in the database using a method that is different from other display levels. Specifically, Jain et al. fails to provide any display levels that comprise a geographical map with icons located at picture locations on a map and another one of said display levels comprises a plot representing on one axis one characteristic of the images in the database and on another axis another characteristic of images in the database.

The remaining references do not provide any of these features. Tomat et al. describes picture groupings comprising: “film canister” metaphors in which pictures on a digital camera are grouped sequentially into film cans in the same manner, generally, that pictures on a film camera would be grouped by association on a common film roll icon. Tomat et al. also shows a multi-level

layering of a group of pictures organized within an icon that has an appearance of one of the images in the group. However, in Tomat et al. it appears that the user manually organizes the image content to form the groups. Takemoto provides a method for conveniently showing picture content that has already been organized into a conventional hierarchical file and folder structure, and Balogh et al. provides a method for automatically associating metadata content with picture images and further allow for word searching of the pictures. However, in Balogh et al., the search results are presented in list type formats and are not organized into groups for convenient access by a user.

Finally, Takemoto, Tomat et al. and Balogh et al. do not provide any display levels that comprise a geographical map with icons located at picture locations on a map or display levels that comprise a plot representing on one axis one characteristic of the images in the database and on another axis another characteristic of images in the database.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that in view of the above amendments and remarks, that this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Schindler II', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 40,802

Roland R. Schindler II/jrk
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2736
Facsimile: 585-477-1148